on our need for such terms as ' function ', < adaptation
' service ' and c value to the organism ', on our need fc
the kind of teleological thinking implied by them, and fc
regarding every part and process of the organism £
dominated by and given its special character by th
organism as a whole, while all agree that the notion c
wholeness of the organism is a necessary principle c
interpretation of the distinctive peculiarities and pfocesse
of living things, some recognize also the need for
dynamic theory of wholeness.

(5) All, with the exception of Goldstein, imply thai
or express the hope or the faith that, nevertheless, n
modes of activity other than those recognized by physic
and chemistry will ultimately be needed to explain thes
peculiarities.

(6) They take, or incline to take, the view that it is th
peculiar manner in which the matter and energies of th
organism are organized which will ultimately be found t<
render possible an explanation of these peculiarities
overlooking the difficulty that just the production of sucl
organization is the primary problem to be solved. *L*
their doctrine the wholeness exists in virtue of the organiza-
tion, and cannot therefore afford the explanation of it. Th«
question of the nature, source and development of the
organization postulated by them as the ground of whole-
ness remains in their treatment completely obscure.

In addition to this general and most fundamenta
problem of the organizing processes which urgentl}
requires some other explanation than mere reference tc

the wholeness of the organism, there are a number oi phenomena which cast doubt upon the validity of the principle of wholeness. I make a haphazard list of some of these phenomena.